

Conversation with Barbara and Patricia:

Barbara raises Rubenstein's Cunning of History: Holocaust as coming out of Judeo-Christian tradition (industrialization, radical split between man (sic) and nature (White):

I point out (as relating to my project item, the moral universe of the national security managers--and us):

--The Christian Just War Doctrine never applied to the heathen; it was a set of rules for conflict among Christian rulers leading Christian subjects. The "concern for the individual" and particularly for "the innocent," the weak, for women (sic: note patriarchal "protectiveness") and children, the sick, etc., the civilian (i.e., the Christian! in early days) all applied to "people like us," (a Jewish concept, as well: the chosen people, landmen, the family, clan) (with, of course, pagan/primitive roots as well: "the people, the humans, we": but with "the other" to be fled from, rather than fought, subjugated or exterminated: in pre-urban and pre-agriculture context, where close cohabitation and rivalry were not dictated).

--For the heathen, the rules against killing the innocent did not apply; massacre was acceptable in the Crusades (and against witches and Jews); and massacre was normal in relation to the colonized indigenous people (Indians in America: a victim of the British settlers, as of others; see West Indies, Koning; see slave trade!), and throughout the 19th century and 20th. See Aimee Cesaire on Algeria and Madagascar; French shelling of Haiphong.

--What Hitler did, and Stalin before him, was to use the same methods of colonial conquest and repression on "white people," citizens of industrial societies: that was what was so shocking and unacceptable. But as Rubenstein shows, they preceded this by "denationalizing" these people, taking away their full status--and even identity marks, such as passports--as citizens. As nationality and citizenship became more formalized, the possibility arose of removing these status-marks from selected classes of citizens. Hitler for the Jews; but earlier, Stalin from the Marxist "class enemy," with the "rich, owners, kulaks, imperialists" being stripped of the protective status of common citizenship rights, being "in the family, people like us", being perceived, rather, in the category of "enemy" to be treated as are enemies in war in the Twentieth Century fashion, which, after World War I and still more after Stalin and World War II means, subjected to massacre, like heathen or primitives in the past, but by industrial, technologized and bureaucratized methods. The technology can be primitive, as in Cambodia or Indonesia; but the military-bureaucratic organization is modern, although--as Mumford pointed out--with its counterparts in the archaic empires, Egypt, Assyria and Rome. (Maya? India? Why not China, the ultimate bureaucracy? Does Mumford examine these?)

--There is a special affinity to Christianity in all this, with its radical bifurcation between "us and them," "believers and unbelievers" (see Islam), "saved and damned"; anyone can be saved, by accepting the faith, but if they refuse: fuck 'em. Kill them. The prominence of apocalyptic dogma, Armageddonists (see book on Amarillo) is matched by a President-believer, the perfect leader for military-political programs more deeply rooted in the society than is his own partisan sect, but which lacked an overt ideological faith and fanatic believer as manager. (Compare Carter, even though he too was born-again, and presided over the same programs and policy).

--What Marx did was to give criteria for defining certain members of a national community, an industrialized, "civilized," urban society, as being equivalent to, and treatable as, as a foreign enemy: moreover, an enemy who did not belong to the same moral community, unlike a Christian adversary, but was equivalent morally and practically to the heathen, to indigenous natives/primitives in the periphery/colonies: or, indeed, to Jews in the Christian community, subject to Inquisition and pogroms!

Namely, the class enemy, the rich, the owners, and their lackeys.

A generalization from the French Revolution, and the treatment of aristocrats, and then of "counter-revolutionaries," under the Terror...--

--Stalin applied this category, broadly and ruthlessly; as did Pol Pot.

--Hitler said: That doctrine, of class warfare and hatred, is itself the enemy; Communism is a cover..; it is divisive and false. There are no class enemies in domestic society. There are...racial enemies. The Communists are dangerous because they are led and misled by Jews; some of the rich owners, likewise, because they are Jews or in debt to Jewish bankers, like US politicians.

--Hyp.: Is this not, perhaps, a return to the pre-Marxist social enemy, the "domestic outsider" (a category now filled in Germany and France by the "guest workers," and the Algerians in France, etc.), the Jew? (and now, everywhere, the Muslim, the PLO/Libyan).

--What is said to be new of the anti-Jewish campaign under Hitler was that for the first time it aimed at extermination (rather than conversion, subordination, segregation or extradition). But this was not a first for Europe; Hitler modeled the Nazi Party on the Communist Party (did he not? With in turn, both being modeled on the Jesuits! managers of the Inquisition?) (see now, clandestine Catholic structures, like the Knights of Malta, fighting Communists and even more, leftism/revolutionary tendencies in the Church itself in Latin America and elsewhere).

And the Communist Party in Russia had already carried out extermination campaigns domestically. First, during the Civil War (? e.g. against the Makhnovites, and anarchists,...); then, under Stalin, against the "kulaks"; then against the "traitors" in the Party itself, and the Army....All this before the Final Solution began...which was, as it happens, in occupied territories in the Soviet Union. (How important a factor was Nazi extermination of Jews in Russia to the development of intense anti-Nazi feeling among the occupied Ukrainians, etc.? Or was it the fact that the Nazis didn't distinguish that much between Russian Jews and other Soviet citizens, regarding them all--along with Poles--as sub-human races? Could the Nazis have been much more popular in Russia and East Europe by exterminating Jews but treating all others "decently," more like the French or Dutch?)

--So, the difference between "National Socialism" and Soviet Socialism is the difference between having racial enemies and class enemies. (Western capitalist societies can tolerate the former, in their midst and as a trading partner if it is willing, much more readily than the latter! See the difference in attitude toward South Africa and toward Nicaragua and Cuba, a matter generally regarded as perplexing.) (Notice how tolerant and comfortable the West has become with China, now that it no longer condemns its own rich, despite its unchanged, near-total authoritarianism.

By the way, class hatred by the rich, in power, or hatred of the poor and powerless or of organized workers and revolutionary priests by rich, landowning or military regimes, is also quite tolerable within the Western system. It is hatred of capitalists or capitalist practices--in particular, departures from multilateral trading systems, in particular that exclude US firms or diminish their profit-making and investment opportunities--that threaten US "vital interests": i.e., (as MBG says this morning) our "lethal interests".

"Vital/lethal interests" are interests we will kill for, massacre for, threaten or use nuclear weapons for: which is also to say, interests for which we will risk, and perhaps bring about, class, national and species suicide.

The discovery that Presidents of both parties, throughout the postwar era, have threatened and seriously risked nuclear weapons in the course of Third World interventions, raises whole new questions about the nature of US "interests" in those areas.

There may, in a crisis, be reasons of personal or group psychology that lead to deliberately heightening such moral and physical risks, without regarding the external interests at stake, in a material sense, as all that great. (That is, humans and organizations may act as if they thought certain losses would be "worth risking all, worth dying or massacring for", because these

losses have, in the contextual circumstances, the meaning of "intolerable humiliation, failure, deserving of shame or guilt or condemnation or loss of status..."

--Armageddon as The Final Solution. (Quite explicitly: of the Jewish Question! and Israel! as well as the general problem of Unbelievers, those who reject the Faith. Those who accepted the Faith, after Constantine, also accepted Empire. Later, in the Middle Ages, it meant accepting the Church: and local lords; then, the aristocratic order; then the Absolute Monarch. Then, Capitalism. Whereas Marxist/Soviet Communism meant Atheism with respect to both Church ("God") and Capitalism (and Liberalism, in domestic society--the State/Party replaces God--and in foreign trade: the aspect, along with Third World revolution, that generated the need for the Cold War.

--How does Hitler's interest in witchcraft, Satanism?--according to Kubrin--relate to all this? Including Armageddon?